



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,258	12/03/2003	Nisheth P. Joshi	M61.12-0563	4660
27366	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/727,258	Applicant(s) JOSHI ET AL	
	Examiner Cam Y T. Truong	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the synchronized intermediate database system" in page 29, lines 5-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 21-34 are dependent on claim 20. Thus, they are rejected under same rationale as discussed in claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 8, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Linstedt (US 2002/0161778).

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

“examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system” as the XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object, Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

“synchronizing a structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system” as mapping the set of relational data to XML document, wherein each table becomes a component, each column a field, with both being mapped to XML elements. The above information shows that the system synchronizes the structure of the relational database in XML schema (col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 35-40);

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “collecting source data from the source system”.

Linstedt teaches receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the

Art Unit: 2162

data into a single area on a single relational database management system. The above information shows the step of collecting data from an enterprise as the source system (paragraph [0005]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Linsteadt's teaching of receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the data into a single area on a single relational database management system to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a method of implementing a data migration, data integration, data warehousing, and business intelligence system at client site.

As to claim 2, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "accessing metadata related to the extensible destination system" as (col. 1, lines 35-50).

As to claim 3, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the extensible destination system includes invoking an initialization tool" as an XML converter 116 maps the set of relational data to an XML document 104 using the set of XML Mapping definitions constructed for a particular application. The XML converter is represented as an initialization tool (col. 4, lines 65-67).

As to claims 4 and 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity base table” as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claims 5 and 22, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity information table” as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitations:

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “collecting source data from the source system”.

Linstedt teaches receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the data into a single area on a single relational database management system. The above information shows the step of collecting data from an enterprise as the source system (paragraph [0005]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Linstedt's teaching of receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the data into a single area on a single relational database management system to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a method of implementing a data migration, data integration, data warehousing, and business intelligence system at client site.

As to claim 8, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system is done according to migration overhead information" as (col. 5, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 40-57).

6. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Linstedt (US 2002/0161778) and further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claims 6 and 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation "the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table". Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Nelson's teaching of extension table to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

7. Claims 7, 9-10 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Linstedt (US 2002/0161778) and further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claims 9 and 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the migration overhead information is user-configurable".

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

As to claims 10 and 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

As to claims 7 and 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

8. Claims 11-18, 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Linstedt (US 2002/0161778) and further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claims 11 and 27, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 12 and 28, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how many entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 13 and 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated”.

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau’s teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky’s system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 14 and 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order”. Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau’s teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky’s system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 15 and 31 Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exorting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 16 and 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 17 and 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claims 18 and 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Linstedt (US 2002/0161778) and further in view of Macleod et al (or hereinafter "Macleod") (US 6356901).

As to claim 19, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Varshavsky's system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily.

10. Claims 1-5, 8, 11-18, 27-34, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Lau.

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

“examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system” as the XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object, Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

“synchronizing a structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system” as mapping the set of relational data to XML document, wherein each table becomes a component, each column a field, with both being mapped to XML elements. The above information shows that the system synchronizes the structure of the relational database in XML schema (col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 35-40);

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “collecting source data from the source system”.

Lau teaches retrieving data and transferring data from one system to a relational database. The above information shows the step of collecting data from a system as the source system (col. 1, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of retrieving data and transferring data from one system to a relational database to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a method of implementing a data migration, data integration, data warehousing, and business intelligence system at client site.

As to claim 2, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "accessing metadata related to the extensible destination system" as (col. 1, lines 35-50).

As to claim 3, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the extensible destination system includes invoking an initialization tool" as an XML converter 116 maps the set of relational data to an XML document 104 using the set of XML Mapping definitions constructed for a particular application. The XM converter is represented as an initialization tool (col. 4, lines 65-67).

As to claims 4 and 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity base table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claims 5 and 22, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity information table” as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claims 11 and 27, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein migration overhead information includes information about which entities are to be migrated”.

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau’s teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky’s system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 12 and 28, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein migration overhead information includes information about how many entities will be migrated”. Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau’s teaching of the table corresponding to data

transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 13 and 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 14 and 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 15 and 31 Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 16 and 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 17 and 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claims 18 and 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitations:

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "collecting source data from the source system".

Linstedt teaches receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering

the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the data into a single area on a single relational database management system. The above information shows the step of collecting data from an enterprise as the source system (paragraph [0005]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Linstedt's teaching of receiving data from at least one source system of an enterprise, wherein the data is representative of business operations of the enterprise; delivering the data to a staging area via a first metagate, wherein the staging area focuses the data into a single area on a single relational database management system to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a method of implementing a data migration, data integration, data warehousing, and business intelligence system at client site.

As to claim 8, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system is done according to migration overhead information" as (col. 5, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 40-57).

11. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Lau further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claims 6 and 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation “the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table”. Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to apply Nelson’s teaching of extension table to varshavsky’s system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

12. Claims 7, 9-10 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter “Warshavsky”) (US 6732095) in view of Lau and further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claims 9 and 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the migration overhead information is user-configurable”.

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver’s teaching of UDT to Varshavsky’s system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user’s desire for providing fast and direct access data.

As to claims 10 and 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures”.

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

As to claims 7 and 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

Art Unit: 2162

13. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Lau and further in view of Macleod et al (or hereinafter "Macleod") (US 6356901).

As to claim 19, Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Warshavsky's system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily. As to claim 19, Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Warshavsky's system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Fernandez et al (US 6785673).

Contact Information

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162

Application/Control Number: 10/727,258
Art Unit: 2162

Page 24